

“The Special Collection in Librarianship”:  
Researching the History of Library Science Libraries

Susan E. Searing  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Delivered at the ALISE Annual Conference, Dallas, Texas  
January 19, 2012

Recipient of “Best Conference Paper” award

Published in the *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, 53, no. 4  
(2012): 225-238

© Association for Library & Information Science Education

Contact:

Susan E. Searing  
310 Main Library  
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign  
1408 West Gregory Drive, Urbana, IL 61801  
Phone: 217-333-4456  
Fax: 217-244-4358  
Email; [searing@illinois.edu](mailto:searing@illinois.edu)

## ABSTRACT

Once all ALA-accredited schools had special libraries. Only a few exist today. This paper traces the rise and fall of the library science library and presents data on collections, staffing, budgets, services, and organizational structures. Based on primary sources, including school catalogs, surveys, and directories, as well as an analysis of the scant literature on the topic, a set of questions are developed for further research.

**KEYWORDS:** Library science libraries; academic branch libraries; historical research.

“The Special Collection in Librarianship”: Researching the History of Library Science Libraries.

## INTRODUCTION

For sixty-six years, starting in 1943, a separate, full-service Library & Information Science Library existed within the Main Library building at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Before that time, a study room in the library school's quarters housed an ever-growing collection of professional literature as well as a “demonstration collection” for student use (Stenstrom, 1992). By 2009 the LIS Library held some 30,000 volumes, including a sizeable reference section and course reserves. Cataloging manuals, exemplary subject thesauri, and library-related fiction were shelved in designated areas. Nearly twenty drawers of vertical files contained newsletters, pamphlets, brochures, preprints, bulletins from other schools, and more. The LIS Library subscribed to hundreds of current journals and newsletters in print and housed small collections of other formats, including microforms, CD-ROMs, audiocassettes, DVDs, and blueprints. The library also licensed a rapidly growing collection of electronic journals, books, and reference databases. A full-time librarian and two full-time staff members kept it running, along with student hourly employees and a quarter-time graduate assistant. In short, it was a substantial and well supported collection, oriented toward current teaching and practice and supplemented by the deeper historical collection in the nearby central book stacks.

A photograph from the 1940s shows a large, sunlit room rimmed with shelves full of bound volumes. Students crowd around tables and desks, reading, writing, and

fingering card files (University of Illinois Library School, 1944). Another photo from the 1950s shows a student browsing the new books display, while other students relax in easy chairs and peruse magazines (“A corner,” 1950-51). Despite the presence of computers and copiers, the LIS Library in the first years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century was not much different either in purpose or appearance than it had been fifty years earlier. However, the crowds of students had vanished. Many hours of the day and evening, the study tables and the comfortable armchairs sat empty. In a very real sense, the library was a victim of its own success. Its staff had aggressively acquired electronic resources and developed web-based services for LEEP, the distance education option that began in 1996.

Unsurprisingly, even local users preferred to search and find information online, from the comfort of their home or office, so on-site library usage dwindled. When the University Library launched its New Service Models Program in late 2007—an initiative that would eventually close or merge several departmental libraries--the LIS Library was among the first service points to be reviewed (University Library, 2012).

In May 2009, the LIS Library closed its doors forever, to be replaced by a service configuration that includes a virtual library, librarians embedded part-time at the GSLIS building, and an increased reliance on general reference and centralized collection services. The print collection was distributed among the central book stacks, other departmental libraries, and the library’s storage facility. The materials budget was not cut—indeed, supplemental funding was allocated during the transition—and newly purchased books continue to be placed in the most relevant library location. Staff levels were reduced, but the library personnel dedicated to LIS still includes a full-time faculty member and an almost-full-time staff member, both of whom hold MLIS degrees.

There were protests, of course. The most vocal opposition came from PhD students, one of whom mounted an online petition to “Save the LIS Library.” It was heartening to see such strong support for library services, yet some comments left by the signers--current students and alumni—were puzzling (Petition Online, 2009):

- “We are the library school. Logically, we should have a library.”
- “What? A library school...without a dedicated library?....
- “What's a library school without a library? How embarrassing!”

The truth is, most LIS schools do not have dedicated libraries and seem to function quite well without them. The most recent *ALISE Statistical Report*, which covers the 2008-2009 academic year, includes responses from fifty-five programs regarding library facilities. Eleven claimed to have separate libraries. So far, this author has confirmed the following LIS programs which are still served by separate libraries in 2012: Florida State, North Carolina, North Carolina Central, Pittsburgh, Toronto, UCLA, Western Ontario, and Wisconsin-Madison. Other programs, such as those at Pratt and the University of North Texas, are served by branch libraries that combine LIS collections with other specialized collections. Most LIS collections, however, have been integrated into central campus libraries. At one time there were a great many more dedicated LIS libraries. How many were there? When did they disappear? And why? These are surprisingly difficult questions to answer. This article discusses some preliminary facts gleaned from a range of primary sources and outlines some possible questions and methods for further study.

## ESTABLISHING THE FACTS

The first step in this research project was to develop a timeline of library science libraries. Establishing definitive starting and ending dates for these libraries presents a challenge. Most of the published information about LIS libraries takes the form of directories or surveys which only began to appear in the 1960s. Since these directories and surveys were compiled from voluntary responses to questionnaires, one cannot assume that they are comprehensive or accurate.

The most complete listing of founding dates for library science libraries appears in an unpublished report of a survey conducted by Susan H. Kennedy, a student at the University of Toledo in 1970, in partial fulfillment of her requirements for a master's degree in library science. The survey was motivated by a practical goal (Kennedy, 1970, p.1):

The survey...was undertaken as a preliminary step in the effort of the University of Toledo's Department of Library Science to establish a library science library. The decision to build such an independent collection is related to the department's intention to qualify for accreditation by the American Library Association in the near future.

The University of Toledo's library science program was never accredited (American Library Association, 2012), but the survey stands as a snapshot of library science libraries at that time.

Kennedy's questionnaire, which was sent to non-accredited as well as accredited schools, clearly asked, "When was your library science library established?" The

responses identify the pioneer libraries: Columbia (1887), Simmons (1902), Case Western Reserve (1903), Emory (1905) and the University of Wisconsin-Madison (1906). However, many of the years supplied by the survey respondents match the founding year of the school, implying perhaps that their libraries evolved organically as the schools grew. A published history of the library science library at Columbia is explicit on this point. Darthula Wilcox (1951), the school's librarian, wrote that the collection even pre-dated the school:

The Library of the School of Library Service of Columbia is older than the School itself. Melvil Dewey, knowing for several years that formal classes for the training of librarians would begin in 1887, began collecting materials to be used in instruction. (p. 1)

Along with the books Dewey gathered, the American Library Association deposited its so-called "Bibliothecal Museum" – a collection of forms, equipment, and pamphlets – and from these beginnings grew the largest library science library ever to exist in North America.

From published sources and through correspondence with librarians and archivists, the author has thus far confirmed founding dates for thirty-four library science libraries, from an evolving master list of 115 accredited and non-accredited library science degree programs in North America.

## SCHOOL CATALOGS AND BULLETINS

Williamson's famous report of 1923 made no mention of specialized libraries to support his vision for graduate library education. Rather, the library schools that were subsequently established at universities emphasized in their annual bulletins the riches of the large and diverse collections on their campuses. Even when a separate library science library existed, it usually received less attention in the bulletin than the university's scholarly collections and other nearby notable libraries. Of course, library science libraries could not flourish until there were materials to fill them. The early collections consisted of, not library science books per se, but sample works for acquisitions and cataloging exercises – so-called “practice collections.” Inevitably, as the library profession matured, professional publications proliferated, and libraries developed at library schools to house and organize the literature.

At what point did such collections gain the stature of departmental libraries? Official school bulletins and announcements provide some clues for the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, before directories and survey data became available. For instance, the University of Illinois catalogs for many years repeated a two-paragraph boilerplate description of the riches of the library school library, declaring that “the holdings of the library have been assembled over many years and afford a liberal basis for research” (University of Illinois, 1957, p. 12). Other catalogs were less revealing but did document the existence of separate libraries. In the 1930s and 40s, for example, the catalog of the Peabody Library School (later incorporated into Vanderbilt University) listed a “professional library room” among the school's facilities (George Peabody College, 1934, p. 7).



The annual catalog for the University of Chicago Graduate Library School touted the rich resources of the university's library and other libraries in Chicago, but made no mention of a library science library until 1933-34, when the following information was included under the heading "Equipment and Facilities":

The School...receives the current journals in the field of library science of this and other countries and has within its quarters a special library in which important works dealing with all phases of library science are to be found. (University of Chicago, 1932, p. 4)

Nearly identical language appeared in subsequent catalogs until the 1963-64 number, when the word "School" was replaced with "Library" in a clear reference to Harper Memorial Library (University of Chicago, 1962, p. 3). Why was Chicago's separate library dismantled? Judging from second-hand evidence, it was likely an administrative decision. Kennedy's report on the University of Toledo's survey reproduced in its appendices a letter from Ralph D. Thomson, Director of Libraries at the University of Utah, in which he inveighed against separate collections. After outlining the reasons for his opposition, Thomson invoked the authority of that great library leader, Lester Asheim:

As you are aware, no doubt, Dr. Lester Asheim, now head of the ALA Office of Education, looked at this situation in somewhat the same way I do and, as Dean of the Library School of Chicago, he disbanded the special library collection at that school. I do not believe that he has changed his mind since that time. (Kennedy, 1970, Appendix E.)

Yet even as library science libraries were being closed, new ones were being founded. A paragraph from the 1966/67 catalog of the School of Library and Information Services at the University of Maryland is typical of the information provided to prospective students, and stresses the school's commitment to building a research-level collection: "The library of the School of Library and Information Services includes a basic collection of books and serials, a substantial number of pamphlets and reports in files and current holdings of more than 200 periodicals" (p. 2). Because the school had just opened the year before, the description continues, "In the initial stages of a continuing program to acquire comprehensive holdings of research materials relating to library services, the Library's acquisitions policy incorporates also such related fields as communications and other social sciences" (p. 2).

From this superficial sampling of library school catalogs, it is clear that a more thorough review will be useful both for confirming the existence of libraries and for determining their birth and death dates. Catalogs and bulletins sometimes contain photographs of library spaces as well. However, they do not provide much detail on collections beyond volume counts, and they offer almost no information on user services, staffing, or the integration of the library into the larger life of the school. For a fuller picture, one must turn to survey data.

#### SURVEYS: 1930s-1960s

When Louis Round Wilson surveyed the state of library education at the twenty-six schools accredited by the American Library Association in 1937, he observed that

“they have extensive departmental libraries...special book collections for practice purposes” and “in several instances fairly extensive collections of reports and research materials...” (Wilson, 1937, p. 215). Wilson gathered data on expenditures for books but did not separate out other costs of information provision, such as staffing or subscriptions. He further noted that “in a majority of the institutions the library spends additional funds for bibliographical and other materials which supplement the special book funds of the schools” (p. 218). In other words, the library science libraries did not, and could not, support the curriculum on their own. Yet clearly, Wilson saw a separate library as an indicator of a school’s quality, and he stressed the importance of autonomous collections, for he wrote, “Schools which do not have separate budgets, however, are entirely dependent upon the library for such materials, and to that extent their status is less satisfactory than that of schools which have book funds under their own control” (p. 218).

By the 1960s, library science libraries began to attract attention in their own right. An unpublished survey of library school libraries by Dumont C. Bunn (1961), a masters student in the Division of Librarianship at Emory University, provided the first detailed statistical picture of the personnel, collections, budgets, organization, services and facilities of twenty separate library science libraries. At that time, there were thirty-two ALA-accredited schools; only five reported that they did not have separate libraries. Bunn’s survey instrument, which is appended to his report, was seven-and-a-half pages long, with both quantitative and qualitative questions—more than a hundred data points in all. Frustratingly, although he presented the data for individual libraries, he had promised his respondents confidentiality and only identified them by code numbers.

Among Bunn's interesting findings are that 80% of the libraries were housed in the same building as the main library collection. One must keep in mind, however, that many of the schools were also located within the main library at that time. All but one of the responding libraries employed at least a part-time professional librarian, and the majority of these librarians reported not to the school but to the campus library. A quarter of the librarians also had teaching duties. There was wide variance in the number of volumes held, from a low of 3,275 to a high of 71,949; the median collection size was 13,212 volumes. While two libraries reported subscribing to over a thousand periodicals, four received fewer than a hundred; the median number of subscriptions was 207. Most of the schools housed a practice cataloging collection, and sixteen of the twenty libraries also maintained a collection of children's literature. A few libraries collected motion pictures and slides; more held filmstrips and microfilm. In contrast to common practice today, none of the library science librarians had sole responsibility for developing the collections; this duty was typically shared with the faculty. Sixteen of the twenty libraries classified their holdings in the Dewey system; three, in Library of Congress; and one, in Cutter Expansive (Bunn, 1961).

Bunn elicited detailed information about hours of operation, the handling of reserve books, library orientation, seating capacity, and more. He also asked librarians for their views on whether standards were needed for library science libraries. The respondents split on this issue. Some felt that standards would give them leverage to lobby for more resources, while others commented that local curricula and campus library practices varied so greatly that standardization would be unfeasible. Bunn argued that the survey data showed less variance than the librarians supposed. Furthermore,

where wide variances did exist, such as collection size, budget differences offered a simple explanation. He urged further exploration of standards, but no evidence has been found to suggest that the idea ever caught on.

Bunn's survey painted a very detailed overall picture of library science libraries at the start of the Sixties, yet, as already mentioned, it did not identify individual libraries. The earliest actual listing of LIS libraries dates from 1964, in a brief report of a survey by David Kaser, who was at that time the director of the Joint University Libraries in Nashville and a professor of library science at Peabody. After commenting that "a search of the literature reveals very little information concerning the libraries of the library schools" (p. 17), Kaser reported the results of his survey of ALA-accredited schools, which at that time numbered thirty-six. "Surprisingly, all replied," he wrote (p. 17). Seven responding schools did not have separate libraries for library science, but the remaining twenty-nine did. Kaser's brief questionnaire asked about the size of the collection, the number of hours per week it was open, the number and levels of staff, and the expenditures for books, periodicals, and binding.

[Place Table 1 about here]

Table 1, reproduced from Kaser's article (p. 17) shows the wide range of answers to his questions. When it came to collection size, Columbia dwarfed every other institution, with 90,000 volumes in its library science library. The next closest was Berkeley, with approximately 34,000. At the bottom of the ranking by size was McGill, with not quite 1,300 volumes. The hours which students could access the collections also

varied widely, from Indiana's minimal forty and a half hours per week, to several libraries that stayed open more than ninety hours per week, including Columbia, Kent State, Michigan, Oklahoma, and Rosary (now Dominican). There appears to have been no correlation between collection size and hours of access.

Similar wide ranges were revealed for staffing levels and collection-related expenditures, prompting Kaser to remark on the differences: "The range of variation in the replies would seem to indicate little, if any, consensus among library educators as to what they feel a library school collection must do for their students" (p. 19). He went on to surmise that the widely differing answers also reflected "local circumstances—e.g., the extent of the curriculum; the age or youth of the program; varying teaching methods; the vagaries of budget-making; the strength, management, and relative proximity of an institution's general collections; the availability of space; and other less readily ponderable factors" (p. 19). Kaser thus echoed the sentiment, expressed by several respondents to Bunn's survey, that library science libraries were strongly shaped by the schools and libraries of which they were part.

Beginning in the late 1960s, intermittently published surveys and directories of library science libraries offer detailed data on individual collections, as well as comparative analyses. However, these later sources suffer from incompleteness. After Kaser, no investigator or compiler ever achieved a 100% response rate.

SURVEYS: 1970s-1980s

Susan Kennedy's unpublished survey of 1970, on behalf of the University of Toledo, was mentioned above as a core source for identifying libraries for this study. Kennedy's findings echoed Bunn's and Kaser's in many areas, but also revealed some shifts. For example, the majority of the librarians responding to Kennedy's questions about collection development indicated that the library science librarian had sole or primary responsibility for selecting materials (p. 45). Kennedy's study also stands out because she surveyed non-accredited programs as well as accredited ones. Altogether she received fifty-three responses: twenty-four from accredited and twenty-nine from non-accredited schools. These were kept separate in her analysis, and the responses from individual schools were identified.

Of the twenty-four accredited schools that responded, only two—Oregon and Southern California—did not have a separate library science library, although two additional respondents—Rutgers and Hawaii—indicated that their collection was shelved within the regular library collection. Among the twenty-nine non-accredited schools, the numbers were more evenly divided—thirteen with and fifteen without a library science library. Eight of the accredited schools reported that their library science libraries were in a separate facility (presumably, the school's quarters) while 14 were in a special section of the regular library. As these responses suggest, and as this author has discovered through correspondence with LIS librarians about the history of the collections they currently maintain, the very definition of "library science library" is uncertain. Does the phrase refer only to full-service collections with their own space, staff, circulation systems, and internal acquisitions and cataloging processes? Or were segregated shelving locations within larger libraries considered to be "library science

libraries?’’ The lack of clarity on this point complicates the interpretation of past surveys and directories and cautions against any sort of meta-analysis.

Because Kennedy’s survey was intended to help the University of Toledo plan its own library science library, it emphasized questions about collection building. Most respondents could not answer her questions about the size and cost of their opening day collections, but many responded with advice about selection tools (p. 46-49). Prominent among the recommendations was the published catalog of the Columbia library (Columbia University, 1962) and the acquisitions lists prepared by several of the existing libraries. Kennedy concluded her study by stating that a separate library science library was essential for successful library education:

In spite of a few opinions to the contrary, the great majority of graduate schools of library science seem to recognize that the library school differs in its demands on the library from other departments and that successful teaching of library skills and knowledge requires a separate library science library. (p.52)

The 1970s might be described as the peak flowering of library science librarianship. Kennedy’s report includes a substantial appendix of materials provided by Doris H. Asher, the head of the Library Science Library at the University of Michigan. Asher was the chair of the Library Science Librarians Discussion Group in ALA, which had been established in 1968 within the Library Education Division of ALA. In response to Kennedy’s survey she sent a stack of mimeographed newsletters, which included responses to a survey the group members had undertaken among themselves. Other topics broached in Asher’s newsletters (which resembled memos more than the usual sort



of newsletter) included the acquisition of library annual reports, library school catalogs, blueprints, and building programs. The discussion group also distributed lists of surplus journal issues which were offered to fill gaps in other collections (Kennedy, 1970, appendices). (The discussion group still exists—now known as the LIS Collections Discussion Group, a unit of ACRL. An email list has replaced its newsletter.)

In 1971, researchers at Drexel conducted another survey of library science librarians at ALA accredited schools, which by then numbered fifty-two, and received twenty-four usable responses (Gwyn, Boyd & LaBorie, 1974). All data were reported in ranked tables. Although the libraries are identified in the tables by a code number only, an appendix deciphers the codes, making it possible to associate responses with individual schools. The general trends in this survey mirror those of the earlier surveys. The authors observed a correlation between reporting line and location (school versus library), which was hardly surprising. The survey attempted to gauge the relative size of library science collections compared to overall university library holdings, but incomplete reporting rendered the data inadequate for comparative purposes.

Fifteen respondents answered a question about the percentage of the library science library budget expended for “library science” versus “information science” or “other.” The responses ranged considerably, possibly reflecting the uneven penetration of information science into the traditional curriculum at that time. The authors also noted that “lack of uniform definitions regarding these two terms greatly limited the usefulness of this question” (p.10). Pratt Institute spent the most on information science—40% of its budget—while Simmons reported the lowest amount, just half of a percent. The median was 25%.

Based on survey responses, the researchers divided library science libraries into three distinct groups that were nearly equal in numbers. “Group I” consisted of nine libraries that performed all or most library operations, including acquisitions and cataloging. These full-fledged libraries had the largest professional staffs. “Group II” consisted of eight libraries that performed their own circulation and stack maintenance but no major acquisitions or cataloging. Group II libraries tended to have staffs of the same size as Group I, but with fewer professionals. “Group III” consisted of seven libraries which performed none or only one major function. Group III libraries had less total staff and fewer professionals than groups I and II. The researchers concluded that staffing levels were correlated to functions, not to collection size or FTE enrollment. The survey also suggests the extent to which library science librarians were integrated into the schools. Seventy-seven percent of the librarians attended school faculty meetings, and 59% attended curriculum committee meetings.

In 1986, Margaret E. Galloway published a brief report of a four-question survey. Forty-nine of fifty-six ALA accredited schools provided data on funding sources, location and staffing. Forty-one library science collections were funded primarily through the main library’s budget, while eight were funded through their schools or departments. Thirty-four collections were located within the main library, twelve in the school or department’s quarters, and three in other branch libraries. Of those housed in the main library, thirteen were a separate unit; the remainder were integrated into the general collection. As with earlier surveys, staffing levels varied considerably. Galloway noted a growing trend among LIS programs to treat the main campus library as a laboratory

collection, which she attributed both to budgetary pressures and to the expansion of the curriculum.

The last known survey of library science libraries was conducted by Alma Dawson in 1989, on behalf of the ACRL Discussion Group of Library Science Librarians. The report was disseminated within the group but never published. The questionnaire was sent to sixty ALA accredited programs and nineteen others. Forty usable responses were returned, 85% of them from accredited programs. By this time, 55% of the responding libraries were “located in an integrated setting” rather than a separate branch. Separate branch locations were more common where PhD programs existed. On average, libraries serving PhD programs had larger staffs, though two reported having no professional librarian, whereas all libraries supporting masters-level programs had at least a half-time professional on staff. Consistent with earlier surveys, wide variance was seen in materials budgets, which ranged from under \$2,000 to over \$125,000. The average collection size had increased to 32,155 volumes, though again there was a wide spread. The mean number of serial subscriptions was 551, but that average masked a wide difference between masters and PhD programs; the latter had on average three times the number of subscriptions.

Like earlier surveys, Dawson’s concentrated on collections and budgets. It was the first survey to ask about journal cancellations; evidently library science libraries were affected by the same economic trends that affected other libraries in the late 1980s. New questions were posed about services as well, revealing a strong involvement in both general and course-integrated user education and widespread use of online and CD-ROM search services. Some libraries reported providing other special services, such as

current awareness bulletins, journal routing, and SDI for faculty. Thirteen libraries were responsible for special collections, typically in the area of youth literature or the history of print culture.

## DIRECTORIES

In addition to surveys, directories of library science libraries were sponsored by various ALA units. A 1977 compilation (Nielsen) listed forty-six accredited and seventeen non-accredited schools. It intentionally covered both separate and integrated collections. The entries included the names and addresses of the librarian and the school's dean; the highest degree awarded by the school; the collection budget; the total number of volumes; and the specific numbers of periodical titles, annual reports, newsletter titles, and juvenile books. The entries also described interlibrary loan policies, cited any publications produced by the library, and noted whether the school had a thesis requirement. An accompanying set of tables showed the responses from each library to twenty-four more questions, spanning enrollment, open hours, facilities (seating capacity, number of carrels, presence of a student lounge), personnel (number of staff, reporting line, and whether the librarian had faculty rank and/or status), reserve collections, audiovisual equipment, computer terminals, and responsibility for cataloging. To the question, "Has a user study been done?", only 22% replied "yes," but in 1977, that might have well been a higher rate than for the profession at large. There is no indication that the wealth of comparative data in the directory was ever subjected to statistical analysis,

but no doubt library science librarians found it enlightening to compare their library to those at similar institutions.

Why didn't library science librarians simply turn to the annual *American Library Directory* or Ash's *Subject Collections*, or similar sources that included branch libraries, rather than compiling their own directories? Joel Lee, librarian at ALA's headquarters, did just that when he constructed a card file of information about nearly two hundred library science libraries. Lee did not limit his search to academic libraries; he also sought out professional collections at public libraries, state and provincial libraries, library associations, special libraries, and more. In the process, he discovered that general directories of subject collections had many gaps and errors (Lee, 1980).

## THEMES IN THE LITERATURE

In addition to surveys and directories, there have been a small number of other publications about library science libraries and the issues pertaining to them. The literature was never extensive, but so many articles and reports appeared in the late 1960s and early 1970s that these decades in particular demand attention. The rising profile of library science libraries was confirmed when the *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* included a long essay on their history and current status (Kindlin & Engle, 1975). Two key themes dominated the research and opinion pieces of that era: the debate over separate versus integrated collection; and inter-institutional cooperation and networking.

### *Separate versus integrated collections*

The debate over separate versus integrated library science collections surfaced periodically and has been echoed in other disciplines. At the 1968 Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, held in Albany, Robert Lee (1968) presented a paper titled “The Special Collection in Librarianship,” in which he outlined five reasons for establishing a separate library (p. 1-2):

- *Efficiency*: Students and faculty will use the materials more if they are close at hand. Time is wasted “running back and forth” when “library science materials are scattered throughout the library building or in many different places on the campus...”
- *Expertise*: A full-time library school librarian, familiar with the curriculum and the faculty, will build a better collection of “meaningful materials.”
- *Protection of the general library*: A library school library relieves pressure on other library areas, such as the technical services department, and diverts students from interfering with general library processes.
- *Morale*: The library serves as a home base for students and faculty and contributes to school morale.
- *Loss reduction*: “In the separate library school library there is usually more awareness of the need for additional copies of materials and the need for photocopying of journal articles. This results in better control and less loss of materials.”

Lee pointed out that the library school library's objectives were not only to provide written materials for study and research, but also to provide a laboratory space, an ambiance that encouraged reading, and a model of "effective, modern library practice" (p. 3). Lee recommended the extent to which a library science library should collect various types of materials to fulfill these aims. Much of the published literature on library science libraries, before and after Lee, has likewise addressed collection issues, though seldom in such a prescriptive manner.

Related to the debate over the desirability of separate collections was the question of the library science library's role as a laboratory or model library. Though detailed descriptions of laboratory libraries in operation are scarce, some writers made compelling cases for library science libraries as settings where students might gain practical experience (Fingerson, 1973; Kiewitt, 1978). However, the counter-argument that laboratory collections were "artificial" and did "not reflect the larger world of information availability" eventually prevailed at most schools (Prentice 1987, p. 11).

### *Cooperation and networking among library science librarians*

Another prominent theme was the need for cooperation among library science librarians. In 1971 library science librarians held a conference of their own in Atlanta. The two-day event was called the Institute on the Role of the Library School Library in Education for Librarianship, and twenty-one library science librarians took part in it. The institute built on the momentum generated at the 1969 Albany conference on the library literature, where the "traditional neglect of the libraries supporting library education" was acknowledged (Butzin, 1973, p. 1). Importantly, the Atlanta institute addressed both

collections and user services. The leitmotif running through the speeches and discussions was the pressure exerted on library science libraries by “growth.” The dimensions of growth included the increase in the available literature, the expansion of the curriculum, and the advent of new audiovisual technologies.

The opening speaker, Martha Jane K. Zachert, urged her listeners to view their libraries as special libraries engaged in providing service. A speaker from the H.W. Wilson Company discussed the latest developments in journal indexing. Other speakers focused on cooperative acquisitions, approval plans, service innovations, and the brave new world of instructional media. A panel of alumni shared their experiences and recommendations. Russell Bidlack, dean of the School of Library Science at the University of Michigan, reported on ALA’s progress in drafting a new set of standards for accreditation; and A. Venable Lawson, director of Emory University’s Division of Librarianship, concluded the institute with advice on planning, management, and communication with users. Unfortunately, the institute was never repeated. The active network of library science librarians in ALA—affiliated at first with the Library Education Division and later with ACRL—has waxed and waned over the past forty years.

## DIRECTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

This research project has only begun to tap the sources for a history of library science libraries. Several further avenues of inquiry beckon.



First, a timeline of library science libraries' foundings and closures must be completed and confirmed. Although dates alone convey very little, in the aggregate they give shape to the general story of library science libraries. Published dates are often missing or unreliable, and therefore the author has been corresponding with librarians and archivists at a number of universities. Many were unaware of the historical roots of the LIS collections and services for which they are responsible, and they have enthusiastically delved into their own institutional history.

Second, further research must focus on the influence of the ALA accreditation standards on the creation and sustaining of library science libraries. The standards never mandated separate libraries, yet for many years they were treated as though they did. That misperception was most likely fostered by the "Statement of Interpretation" which accompanied the 1951 standards. The interpretation made definite references to "the library school library as an important part of the facilities for professional instruction" (American Library Association, 1952; Bidlack, 1973). Although Renee Tjoumas (1992) concluded that the standards had little effect on library science collections, judging by how rarely the collections were formally assessed, it does appear that the mere existence of special libraries for library science owed much to the perception that they strengthened the case for accreditation.

Third, it is worth exploring the extent to which library school deans and/or library directors set the direction for library school libraries. The (thus far) unsubstantiated statement that Dean Asheim shut down the Chicago library because he was philosophically opposed to separate collections is intriguing. The opposite sentiment surfaces in the autobiography of Paul Wasserman (2000). He insisted on the

establishment of a library science library and the hiring of a faculty librarian as conditions of signing on as the first dean of Maryland's graduate library school.

I believed that a professional school library should serve as both a training ground and a laboratory linked to the classroom...The librarians of our professional school library would be identified with the faculty and the student body of the school. To fortify the association, the librarian would enjoy faculty status, would participate fully in the school, and would be invited to teach regularly. Having the resources for development of a library school library, directed by a librarian who would also be a faculty member, was one of the stipulations of my appointment. (p. 199-200)

Who was the maverick—Asheim or Wasserman? In companion articles in the Fall 1966 issue of the *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, Brian Land of Toronto and Robert B. Downs of Illinois presented their views on library school spaces. Land argued strongly in favor of separate library school libraries. Downs, after playing devil's advocate and presenting several reasons to avoid separate libraries, also expressed strong support for them. Did other deans feel as positive about their libraries?

Fourth, a fully realized examination of the role and impact of library science libraries must look at the librarians and the users they served. In the proceedings of the 1971 Atlanta institute, a summary of a panel presentation began, "A real criticism of library school librarians is that they seem to be among the most passive of the passive-oriented librarians." This negative quality was attributed to the "formidable task" the library science librarian faced in carving out an identity for herself (Zachert, Parker, Lauer & Galvin, 1973, p. 49). So far, very little information about the librarians has been

uncovered, aside from one study (Pope & Armitage, 1971) that examined their academic status, benefits (such as tenure and travel support), salaries, and degree of responsibility for teaching and collection development. No published studies of library science students' use of library science libraries have been discovered yet, though data may exist as part of more general studies of students' experiences of, or satisfaction with, graduate LIS education. Piecing together background on the library science librarians and library users may require interviews or archival digging.

Fifth, for a few library science libraries, it appears that sufficient resources or institutional memories exist to compile case studies. The libraries at Columbia (Wilcox, 1951), Illinois (Stenstrom, 1992; Searing, 2009), and Louisiana State (Chalaron & Dawson, 2001), for example, have all been the subject of written histories that could serve as launching points for further investigation. The potential sources of information on these and other individual libraries include the published histories of library schools, informal reminiscences, contemporary descriptions in the library journal literature, and descriptions of library resources in school bulletins, newsletters and other publications. These, plus institutional archives, could form the basis for a select number of case studies and perhaps some fruitful comparisons.

The ultimate goal of this research project is to situate the rise and fall of library science libraries within the larger history of LIS education. What aspects of library education made separate libraries so common in the past? What changes in content and methods of library education made the dissolution of separate libraries possible? Were library science libraries bellwethers for the drive toward library centralization and consolidation that has recently accelerated on many university campuses (Vyhnaneck &

Zlatos, 2011)? If so, what lessons do they hold for librarians in other fields who are now engaged in reconfiguring their services?

## CONCLUSION

A search of the literature reveals very little information concerning the libraries of the library schools. Apparently the considerable body of research that has been conducted under the direction of the schools has not yet comprehended this somewhat homely, although fruitful area of investigation. (Kaser, 1964, p. 17)

Nearly half a century later, these words still ring true. The historical record of library support for LIS education is fragmented and partial. The present study makes a start at finding and piecing together the facts that do exist, in hopes of discerning a meaningful narrative. It also begs the question, how well are LIS programs supported by libraries today? We lack comparative data to assess, for example, whether the few remaining separate libraries fare better budget-wise than the integrated collections, or whether their users are more satisfied or better served. We don't know how many LIS librarians there are, although it seems clear from a sampling of university library staff directories that most librarians with subject responsibility for LIS also juggle other subject responsibilities and department liaison duties. A recent study of LIS collecting at university libraries that do not support LIS programs (Little, 2011) stands out as a unique contribution to the literature.

The departmental library paradigm is in decline, and separate branch libraries are falling out of favor on many campuses. A combination of economic, intellectual, and practical factors is driving this change. LIS libraries have been on the cutting edge of this paradigm shift, but their disappearance and transformation has been so gradual as to go unnoticed and certainly unstudied. This research project hopes to rectify that omission and thus contribute a new perspective on the entwined histories of library education and academic librarianship.

## REFERENCES

American Library Association, Board of Education for Librarianship. (1952). Statement of interpretation, to accomplish standards for accreditation adopted by the ALA Council, July 13, 1951. Chicago: American Library Association.

American Library Association, Office for Accreditation. (2012). Accredited library and information studies master's programs from 1925 through present. Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/accreditedprograms/directory/historicallist>.

Bidlack, Russell E. (1973). Accreditation standards for library school libraries. In Butzin, Diane (Ed.), *Institute on the Role of the Library School Library in Education for Librarianship* (pp. 81-92). Atlanta: Division of Librarianship, Emory University.

Bunn, Dumont C. (1961). *A survey of the libraries of ALA accredited library schools*. Atlanta: Division of Librarianship, Emory University.

Butzin, Diane. (Ed.). (1973). *Institute on the Role of the Library School Library in Education for Librarianship, May 2-4, 1971*. Atlanta: Division of Librarianship, Emory University.

Chalaron, Peggy, & Dawson, Alma. (2001). The library and information science collection at Louisiana State University. *Louisiana Libraries*, 63(4),10-13.

Columbia University. Library Service Library. (1962). *Dictionary catalog of the Library of the School of Library Service*. Boston: G.K. Hall.

A corner in the Library School Library, University of Illinois [Photograph]. (1950-51).

Retrieved from:

<http://www.library.illinois.edu/archives/archon/index.php?p=digitallibrary/digitalcontent&id=4083>.

Dawson, Alma, & ACRL Discussion Group of Library Science Librarians. (1990).

Report on the survey of library science collections. (Unpublished manuscript.)

Downs, Robert B. (1966). Quarters and facilities: An administrator's point of view. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 7(2), 84-89.

Fingerson, Ronald L. (1973). The library science library: a necessary duplication.

*Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 13, 193-197.

Galloway, Margaret E. (1986). Library and information science collections: a survey on financing, housing, and staffing of collections for schools of library and information sciences. *College & Research Libraries News*, 47(10), 654-655.

George Peabody College for Teachers. (1934). Peabody Library School announcement, 1934-1935, including summer 1934. *Bulletin, New Series*, 23 (7).

Gwyn, Jacquelyn. (Comp.). (1974). Library science libraries: a quantitative survey. (Drexel library publication no. 101). Philadelphia: Drexel University Libraries. (ERIC Document No. ED110029).

Kaser, David. (1964). Library school libraries. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 5, 17-19.

Kennedy, Susan H. (1970). Library school libraries: a survey and analysis. (Unpublished thesis). University of Toledo, Toledo, OH.

Kiewitt, Eva L. (1978). Reference collections of accredited library school programs. *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 19(1), 55-59.

Kindlin, Jean, & Engle, June. (1975). Library school libraries. In A. Kent, H. Lancour & J. E. Daily (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of library and information science* (1<sup>st</sup> ed., Vol. 16, pp. 1-22). New York, NY: Marcel Dekker.

Land, Brian. (1966). Library school quarters and space – the ideal. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 7(2), 71-83.

Lee, Joel M. (1980). Collections in librarianship and information science. *Drexel Library Quarterly*, 15(3), 78-94.

Lee, Robert. (1968). The special collection in librarianship. In D. Mitchell, & B. Choate (Eds.), *Conference on the Bibliographic Control of Library Science Literature, State University of New York at Albany, April 19-20, 1968* (pp. 1-14). (ERIC Document No. ED050744).

Little, Geoffrey. (2011). Collection development in library and information science at ARL libraries. *Collection Building*, 30(3), 135-139.

Nielsen, Carol S. (Comp.). (1977). *Directory of library science collections: 1977*. (2nd ed.) Chicago: American Library Association, Library Education Division.



Petition Online. (2009). *Save the LIS Library!* Retrieved from  
<http://www.petitiononline.com/petitions/katsharp/signatures>.

Pope, Elspeth, & Armitage, Katherine. (1971). Status of library school librarians. *Journal of Education for Librarianship*, 11(4), 340-342.

Prentice, Ann E. (1987). Collection development in schools of library and information science. *Library and Information Science Annual*, 3, 3-12.

Searing, Susan E. (2009). The Library and Information Science Library, 1990s to 2009. Retrieved from  
[http://www.library.illinois.edu/lis/about/LIS\\_Library\\_history\\_update.pdf](http://www.library.illinois.edu/lis/about/LIS_Library_history_update.pdf).

Stenstrom, Patricia. (1992). The Library and Information Science Library. In W.C. Allen & R.F. Delzell (Eds.), *Ideals and Standards: The History of the University of Illinois Graduate School of Library and Information Science, 1893-1993* (pp. 68-80). Urbana, IL: Graduate School of Library and Information Science.

Tjoumas, Renee. (1992). Evaluation of library science collections in the accreditation process. In A. Kent (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science* (vol. 50, Suppl. 13, pp. 185-198). New York: Marcel Dekker.

University Library, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. (2012). New service model programs. Retrieved from <http://www.library.illinois.edu/nsm/>.

University of Chicago. (1932). The Graduate Library School number for the sessions of 1933-34. *Announcements*, 33 (3).

University of Chicago. (1962). The Graduate Library School, 1962-1963. *Announcements*, 62 (8).

University of Illinois Library School. (1944). Announcement: 1944-1945. *University of Illinois Bulletin*, 41(24).

University of Illinois Library School. (1957). Library School, 1958-1960. *University of Illinois Bulletin*, 55(32).

University of Maryland. (1966). Catalog of the School of Library and Information Services, 1966-67. *University of Maryland Bulletin*, 22(5). Retrieved from <http://www.archive.org/details/schooloflibraryi1966univ>.

Vyhnaneck, Kay, & Zlatos, Christy. (2011). *Reconfiguring Service Delivery: SPEC Kit* 327. Washington, DC: Association of Research Libraries.

Wasserman, Paul. (2000). *The best of times: A personal and occupational odyssey*.  
Detroit: Omnigraphics.

Wilcox, Darthula. (1951). The Library of the School of Library Services, Columbia  
University, New York City. *University of Illinois Library School Occasional Papers*, 20.  
Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Library School.

Williamson, Charles C. (1923). *Training for library service: A report prepared for the  
Carnegie Corporation of New York*. New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Wilson, Louis R. (1937). The American library school today. *Library Quarterly*, 7, 211-  
245.

Zachert, Martha Jane K., Parker, Lucretia, Lauer, Evelyn & Galvin, Thomas J. (1973).  
Improving library services and classroom effectiveness: A panel discussion. In D. Butzin  
(Ed.), *Institute on the Role of the Library School Library in Education for Librarianship*,  
May 2-4, 1971 (pp. 47-51). Atlanta: Division of Librarianship, Emory University.

TABLE I								
	Vols. Now Held	Hrs. Open Weekly	Staff Size			Materials Expenditure		
			No. of Libns.	No. of Clerks	Hrs. of Student Help	Spent for Books	Spent for Periodi- cals	Spent for Binding
High	90,000	99.0	2.0	3.0	180	9,300	3,300	1,600
Median	15,496	80.3	0.95	.57	48	2,365	645	427
Low	1,274	41.5	0.5	0.0	10	500	240	50

Table 1

Reprinted from: Kaser, D. (1964). Library school libraries. *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 5(1), p.17.